

It is hard to know exactly what the administration is demanding in the negotiations because it has refused to share the information with Congress. Reports, however, and whatever we can find out, indicates that the administration is asking for unilateral authority over all U.S. military operations in Iraq, the right to arrest and detain Iraqi citizens, legal immunity for American military contractors, control over Iraqi borders and air space, and perhaps permanent bases, making Iraq a virtual American colony.

All this has brought a wave of protest from Iraqis of all political and religious stripes. It seems that we have finally succeeded in uniting the Iraqis against us. An Iraqi Government spokesman actually has said, "The Iraqi Government's vision differs from that of the Americans, who think the agreements will give them almost totally a free hand in Iraq, and that, as a military force, they must have absolute powers."

In addition, members of the Iraqi Parliament representing the majority of parties in that body wrote a letter to the Congress which was released just last week by my colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, Representative DELAHUNT, the chairman on the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight. This letter includes a demand for the withdrawal of American troops. It said, in part, that "the majority of Iraqi representatives strongly reject any military security, economic, commercial, agricultural investment or political agreement with the United States that is not linked to clear mechanisms that obligate the occupying American military forces to fully withdraw from Iraq in accordance with the declared timetable, and without leaving any military bases, soldiers, or hired fighters."

Madam Speaker, by moving for a permanent military presence in Iraq, the administration is sending the wrong message to the Iraqi people. The American people are also getting that message, along with the rest of the world. It says to the Iraqi people that they will continue to live under foreign military occupation with no end in sight. It tells the American people that the occupation will continue to drain our resources at a time when our citizens are facing dire economic problems at home. And it proves to the world that the administration is determined to tie the next President to the failed policies of the past.

The best course for America is to begin the immediate, responsible redeployment of our troops and military contractors out of Iraq, as this House has mandated. But since the administration is clearly unwilling to do that, the next best thing is for Congress to demand full knowledge of the negotiations, with the right to approve any agreements.

Madam Speaker, the United States must give full national sovereignty

back to Iraq, and we must stop acting like an arrogant occupying power. After more than 5 years of bloody occupation, this is no time to talk about staying in Iraq forever. Instead, it is time to give the Iraq people back their independence. And it is time to bring our brave troops home.

□ 1800

MAGINOT LINE OF INDIFFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the United States has gone to war numerous times to protect the sovereignty of nations. Sixty-four years ago on June 6, thousands of GIs went ashore in France because its borders were invaded by the Nazis. In fact, most of the European countries and north Africa had their sovereign borders overrun by the Nazis.

In the Pacific, the United States fought the Japanese because they had invaded the borders of our territories and the borders of China and Indochina. Americans died. Over 400,000 died protecting all of those borders during World War II.

After World War II, the United States defended the borders of Western Europe nations against that "evil empire" of the Soviet Union and Soviet Communism. In fact, we still have troops in Western Europe. Sixty years later, we still defend those borders. And that is a long time. Then there was the Korean War. In its aftermath with 50,000 Americans killed, we fulfilled our commitment to defend South Korea, and we still have 30,000 troops on that border with North Korea, 50 years plus defending someone else's border. We defend the borders of Iraq and part of the Balkans even to this day.

But Madam Speaker, I wonder why we don't have the same commitment to America's borders? Doesn't that bother anyone? Having been to the southern border of the United States numerous times and seeing the "Maginot Line of Indifference," I am puzzled why we seem to ignore the thousands of trespassers, or invaders, if I can use that term, that come from all nations and cross our border without permission.

When Mexico invaded the United States at Brownsville, Texas, in 1846, we went to war to defend the southern border. When the outlaw, now folk hero, General Pancho Villa and his bandits came into the United States from Mexico to commit crimes in New Mexico, the United States sent General Blackjack Pershing to go after him, even if it meant going to Mexico.

That was during a time when our sovereignty was important to the Nation and to the Federal Government. But the invasion now is much worse. Some estimates put the number of illegals in the United States between 15 and 35 million people. Why don't we have the same moral resolve we had in World

War II and Korea to defend our borders from this stealth invasion? It is the duty of government to protect the citizens of this Nation and the States.

I will read from the Constitution, something we probably ought to do more of in this Congress. Article IV section 4 of the United States Constitution says, "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this union a Republican Form of Government and shall protect each of them against invasion." Invasion means intrusion or encroachment. Why doesn't the Government just simply follow the Constitution and prevent invasion into the United States?

Now some Chamberlain appeasers want to just tell the illegals they can stay. After all, we can use the cheap plantation labor, the appeasers say. Never mind the crimes some of them commit, never mind how they take some social services without paying for them, never mind how some live off Americans and lawful immigrants. Never mind it is illegal to be in the United States without permission.

So why, Madam Speaker, do we defend the borders of other nations but not our own? The Feds say they are trying. But the proof, or the lack of it, is in the results. The border with Mexico is violent. The border is porous, and the border is being invaded. The most powerful nation in the history of the world can stop the secret invasion if it first had the moral resolve to do so, and second, the courage to do whatever is necessary to stop the onslaught of invaders.

Maybe we should even use the National Guard or returning troops from Iraq on our southern border. But doing so would take leadership that is committed in word and deed to protecting the sovereignty of this Nation.

The United States is worth it, Madam Speaker, even if the amnesty crowd and Mexican President Calderon doesn't like it.

And that's just the way it is.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROBERT J. DOLE VA MEDICAL CENTER IN WICHITA, KANSAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to congratulate and to pay tribute to the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in my home State in Wichita, Kansas, for 75 years providing outstanding services and care to our Nation's heroes, our veterans.

Caring for those who have borne the battle is our Nation's utmost responsibility. And for 75 years, the Dole VA Hospital has helped our Nation honor this commitment. Let us take time today to pay tribute to the work of the Dole VA leadership staff and volunteers and the Kansas veterans they

serve each day. Veterans are the people I hold in highest regard only to be exceeded by those individuals who serve those veterans.

Under the skillful leadership of the VA Network 15 Director Dr. Peter Almenoff and hospital director Tom Sanders, the Dole VA Hospital has worked to fulfill its mission: "To improve the health and wellbeing of veterans we are honored to serve." In fact, the Dole VA has received national acclaim in its service to veterans. On a recent rating of VA hospitals for quality of veterans' care, the Dole VA hospital ranked third in the Nation. Our country is fortunate to have these individuals who made the commitment to serve these veterans. What we do in Washington, D.C., pales in comparison to what these individuals do each and every day for our veterans.

On November 16, 1933, the first patient, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, was admitted to the hospital. At that time, there were 150 beds. By the end of 1933, all beds had been filled. In 2008 over 2,000 admissions were recorded at the hospital. The Center now provides a full range of primary, acute and extended care services to veterans from 59 counties in Kansas. Many of these counties make up the First Congressional District that I represent. And despite covering more than 57,000 square miles, the First District is without a VA hospital of its own. Veterans in central and western Kansas rely on the care and services provided by the Dole VA. We are blessed to have such an outstanding facility in Kansas available to those who have given so much on our behalf.

Last month, I had the opportunity to participate in the 75th anniversary jubilee in Wichita attended by the hospital's namesake, former United States Senator Bob Dole, a member of the country's greatest generation and an unending advocate for veterans. Also attending the celebration was the Veterans Department Secretary James Peake, Kansas Senators PAT ROBERTS and SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas Congressman TODD TIAHRT, and Wichita Mayor Carl Brewer.

We listened to Dole speak of his own military service and recovery from wounds he received in World War II in a VA hospital, as well as his leadership in building the World War II Memorial, as co-chair of the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors. With his legacy of service and sacrifice to our country and its veterans, Senator DOLE is an appropriate namesake and inspiration for the hard work and dedication of the leadership, staff and volunteers at the Dole VA.

Again, I wish to congratulate the Dole VA Medical Center for 75 years of care to our country's veterans. On behalf of veterans in Kansas, I thank them for their service.

A RED HERRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, the New York Times CBS spring poll has reported that 68 percent of Americans favor putting restrictions on what is called free trade to protect our domestic industries. That is the highest level of concern since the poll began asking the question in the 1980s, and a 12 percent rise just since 2000.

Only 14 percent of Americans surveyed last year by the Pew Global Attitudes Project said increase in trade was very good for our country. And the American people, by a healthy majority, view NAFTA and NAFTA-like trade agreements as flawed and costing our people more job washout every day. In other words, a majority of people in our country not only believe something is wrong with current U.S. trade policy, enough of them have now been hurt directly by unfair trade that they now know personally what a bad trade deal can yield. When you are almost \$1 trillion in trade deficit, something is fundamentally wrong.

So what does one of America's premier newspapers place on its editorial page this week in response? Do they look inside the gaping job loss and trade deficits our Nation is experiencing and attempt to reshape the policy to again produce a better yield in jobs for our people and Nation? No. They put their head in the sand. And they do so in the form of an editorial that is nothing more than a red herring. Actually, this looks like a herring to me. A red herring. You've heard that old expression which means someone distracts attention from the real issue. They state a half-truth and then wage a fierce argument against that falsehood as if the falsehood were true. It is an old trick.

The New York Times article written by Eduardo Porter, is a complete red herring. He said that people who worry about job loss in America related to trade want to stop trade. He said that those people are isolationists. Nothing could be more untrue.

I say to Mr. Porter the vast majority of the American people want to fix what is wrong with these trade deals. And there is plenty wrong. If he fails to grasp that, he might, as the old expression goes, "fail to see the wall in front of his face and run right into it." Mr. Porter alleges that the majority of Americans who favor putting restrictions on free trade to protect domestic industries will push the new President to be undiplomatic and unreasonable when it comes to what Porter calls economic protectionism.

Mr. Porter, reciprocity is not protectionism. With nearly \$1 trillion net trade deficit sucking more and more jobs out of this country, he should be championing balancing our trade agreement and creating jobs here in America again. But he opines that

other countries, like Canada, Sweden and Germany, in which fewer people favor such measures, are scared that a new trade model would bring about what he calls a trade war. Yeah, you scare them, right? Try to scare the American people.

What Mr. Porter does not understand is that America's hostility is not to international trade, but to trade agreements and deficits that cause job outsourcing, job losses and cuts to middle-class benefits and health coverage. Americans support trade that wins for them and that brings prosperity to America again. They want trade that builds a middle class here at home and abroad. They are tired of being jerked around by the multinational companies that trade them for \$1 an hour worker in China who has no hope of a better life. They want that worker to get a fair deal too. They support trade that creates jobs, America used to do that before we fell into deficit, and exports American products again to customers around the world. They broadly oppose the failed NAFTA model that has sucked jobs and money away from America to corrupt and closed markets that keep their boot on the necks of workers around the world who have no rights. Porter claims trade hawks want to disengage from the world. Wrong again. Nothing could be further from the truth. Americans want to engage. They want reciprocal trade, balanced trade and free trade that builds a middle class, not shatters it.

That is why a number of us introduced a bill he mentions offhand, the trade act, H.R. 6180 which currently has over 50 sponsors and sets guidelines for responsible trade that encourages free trade among free people. Porter says that Europe and Germany don't share our point of view and we should be more like them. I will agree with him on one account. We should be more like them because they have trade balances, not trade deficits. They are sitting pretty compared to ours. We have a \$711.6 trade deficit in 2007, and they, in fact, have surpluses. So Mr. Porter ought to be fighting for a strong America. And that means free trade among free people.

Indeed, the latest monthly trade figures from April show our nation has just gone further in the hole at \$60.9 billion deficit. More red ink = more lost jobs and more workers falling out of the middle class. Yet Canada and Sweden both managed surpluses of about \$30 billion in U.S. dollars. Their trade numbers are moving in the right direction. Germany commanded a trade surplus of more than \$185 billion. I ask Mr. Porter, why shouldn't America move its accounts to balance and surplus? Why does he favor more job washout? More loss of income for our people? More red ink? Furthermore, workers in those countries need not worry about losing their healthcare since the government provides assistance. Those countries trade in order to make money, but our trade policies have resulted in a hemorrhage of our resources.

The New York Times and Mr. Porter ought to be fighting for a strong America—and that